

Remarks

The Examiner's reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments above and comments which follow.

First of all, the undersigned thanks Examiner Sherman for the time taken in the telephonic interview on October 16, 2008. The Examiner's interview summary of October 22, 2008 has been received, and it properly identifies the individuals involved in the interview as well as, broadly, what was discussed.

It is clear, as discussed in the interview, that the major issue is with respect to the interpretation of the claims and the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112. As discussed during the interview, in order to make the claims abundantly clear, the clause in the preamble of claim 16, "avoiding misinterpretation of an image displayed on a matrix display device due to defective cells in the matrix display device", or something similar, would be imported into the body of claim 16 and each of the other independent claims to clearly distinguish from the prior art. Also discussed during the interview, in relation to claim 16, was the second portion of the final clause of the claim (which has now been separated as a separate subparagraph). Addition of the clause "in a copy of said image of pixels corresponding to said defective cells" would be moved as set forth in the claim above to make the language clear. Finally, although not discussed during the interview, it was decided to delete the term "indicate" to make it clear that there is an emphasis or warning of the presence of defective cells in the image display, something quite different from the prior art.

Apart from claim 16, the other independent claims have been amended similarly. Each of the independent claims has had the concluding clause added, similar to claim 16, as discussed above. To the extent that the claims would allow other amendments similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 16, those changes have been made as well.

With the amendments above, it is submitted that the Hoelen reference has now been clearly distinguished in an acceptable manner, and it is understood that the Examiner will still need to conduct a further search once the amendments above have been considered.

It is believed that all is in order and the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner's further and favorable reconsideration is therefore urged.

As this response is being submitted during the fourth month following the Examiner's Office Action, an appropriate Petition for Extension of Time is also submitted herewith.

October 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26935
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 – Fax